THE

# MONTHLY JOURNAL.

VOL. II.] BOSTON, MARCH, 1861. [No. 3.

## THE ORTHODOX DOCTRINE OF EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT.

Review of Dr. Nehemiah Adams's Tract on "The Reasonableness of Future Endless Punishment."

THE different views concerning the future state, held by the Christian Church, may be thus classified; arranging them, exhaustively, under eight divisions: —

I. The Roman-Catholic Church makes three conditions hereafter; viz., —

1. Everlasting joy.
2. Everlasting suffering.
3. Temporal sorrow in purgatory.

II. The Orthodox Protestant Church makes two conditions hereafter; viz., —

1. Infinite and eternal joy.
2. Infinite and eternal suffering.

III. The Old-school Universalists make one condition hereafter; viz., —

1. Eternal joy.

IV. New-school Universalists, and Restorationists, make two conditions hereafter; viz., —

1. Eternal joy.
2. Temporal and finite suffering.

V. Unitarians make an indefinite number of conditions hereafter, according to the various characters and moral states of men.

VI. The Swedenborgians make an indefinite but limited number of heavens and hells, suited to the varieties of character, but having a supernatural origin.

VII. The Spiritualists make the other world like this world, with no essential differences; making it a continuation of the natural life.

VIII. The Annihilationists believe that the finally impenitent will perish wholly, and come to nothing.

This statement includes all, or nearly all, of the views held in the Christian Church concerning the condition of departed souls in the other world. We do not propose to examine them all at the present time; but we shall examine at some length one of them. This is the doctrine which declares that there are but two conditions after death, both permanent and unchangeable; and that the condition of those who are not converted to Christ in this world is a condition of eternal misery in the other, without pause, change, or alleviation. This, being the orthodox, and only orthodox, view of most Protestants, — of Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists, Baptists, — deserves a careful examination. Multitudes in these sects disbelieve it; but it is in all their standards, and belongs to their fundamental and essential doctrines.

For some cause or other, there is evidently an energetic attempt made in some quarters to revive the decaying belief in the doctrine of everlasting punishment in the future state, as a penalty for the sins of this. Dr. Thompson of New York has published a work to this end, called "Love and Penalty." Dr. J. P. Thompson, the author of this book, is considered the leader of New-Haven theology,

— the Elisha on whose shoulders the mantle of Dr. Taylor of New Haven has fallen. Dr. Nehemiah Adams of Boston has labored in the same field; exerting himself to prove this doctrine, in various tracts and other works. Prof. Hovey, of the Baptist Seminary of Newton, has published a little book on the same subject.

The reasons for this new effort to support this terrific doctrine are probably to be found in a wide-spread and increasing disbelief concerning it, pervading the churches nominally Orthodox. This has come from the growing intelligence, and progressive movements of thought, in the Christian Church. The evidences of this belief are numerous and increasing. Those who reject the Orthodox view are a very numerous body, but divided into several parties. There are the old-fashioned Universalists; a valiant race, — men of war from their youth, — who, under the lead of such men as Hosea Ballou and Thomas Whittemore, have spent their lives in fighting the doctrine of everlasting punishment. Very naturally, perhaps, they went to the opposite extreme of opinion, and denied all future suffering. But this view has, we think, ceased to be the prevailing one among the Universalists. The doctrine of ultimate restoration has very generally taken its place. This doctrine also prevails widely in other denominations; not only among the liberal bodies, like the Unitarians, but also among Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists. This view has widely spread, as is well known, in Germany. It was held by Schleiermacher, the father of modern German theology. It tinges the writings of such Orthodox men as Tholuck, Hahn, and Olshausen. Others profess to believe in everlasting punishment, but make it a merely negative consequence of lost time and opportunity: one will be always worse off hereafter in consequence of the neglect of duty. Others

follow Swedenborg, and make the sufferings of hell rather agreeable than otherwise to those who bear them.

In consequence of this wide-spread disaffection toward the Orthodox doctrine, it has naturally happened that attempts have been made to defend it anew. Some of these attempts are before us, and we propose to examine one or more of them now.

It has long seemed to us, that the views held by Unitarians on this subject were far too indefinite and undecided. It is quite as important a question in theology as that of the Trinity: if the last affects the nature of God, this bears on the character of God. It seems to us impossible to hold the common doctrine on this subject, without having the gospel view of the divine character essentially shaken: it is not possible to regard Him as a Being in whom love is the essential attribute. If this is so, as we shall presently undertake to prove, it becomes a matter of vital importance that the doctrine should be disproved and rejected. It is not enough that it should be quietly laid aside: it is due to the truth, that it should be distinctly and fully confuted. For this doctrine, if it be false, is deeply dishonorable to God: it takes away his highest glory; it substitutes fear of him, in the place of love, in the human heart; it neutralizes the peculiar power of the gospel; it degrades the quality of Christian piety, and poisons religion in its fountain.

For what is this doctrine, as it is taught at the present day in all Orthodox churches, and as it stands in all Orthodox creeds? It is, that the moment of death decides, and decides for ever, the destiny of man; that those who die impenitent, unbelieving, and unconverted, are for ever lost, without the possibility of return; that those thus lost are to suffer for ever and ever, without end, the most grievous torments in soul and body. These torments consist in banishment from the presence of God, and positive

sufferings, in addition thereto, of an awful kind. Precisely what they are, it is not, perhaps, necessary for an Orthodox man to believe. There is no Orthodox definition which is authoritative on that point; and considerable range, therefore, is allowable. The suffering may be that of literal fire, or it may not. It may be physical suffering, or the pangs of conscience, the absence of love, and the sense of emptiness. On these points there is some liberty of opinion, doubtless. But we presume that it would not be Orthodox to admit a preponderance, in hell, of good over evil; or to admit, with Swedenborg, the existence of pleasure there, even though it be only a diabolical and sinful pleasure. The doctrine of Orthodoxy certainly is, that evil predominates over good, and pain over pleasure, in the condition of the damned; so that their existence is a curse, and not a blessing. Especially is hope shut out: there is no hope of return, no possibility of escape, no chance of repentance, even at the end of myriads of years. The man who is condemned to imprisonment for life, in solitary confinement, is in an unfortunate condition; but he has hope, — hope of escape, hope of pardon, — sure hope, at all events, of deliverance one day by death from his condition, and a change to something better, or at least to something different. But, in the Orthodox opinion, there is no such alleviation as this to the sufferings of the future state.

It is usual, we know, for many Orthodox preachers to intensify in description the sufferings of the future state, and to task their imagination for multiplied pictures of horror; but we will make no use of this fact in our argument against the doctrine, since the doctrine does not require it. We merely assume that Orthodoxy asserts a preponderance of evil over good in the other world, and that this preponderance is to be continued without end, — for ever. Let us see what this means.

It means that the suffering to be endured hereafter by each individual soul, as a punishment for sins committed in this world, will infinitely exceed in amount all the suffering borne on the surface of the earth, by its total population, from the creation of Adam to the destruction of the world. Each lost soul will suffer not only more, but infinitely more, than all the accumulated sufferings of the human race throughout all time. We shudder as we read the account of the sufferings from hydrophobia, or the burning alive of a slave at the South, or the tortures inflicted by the Holy Inquisition, or the horrors of a field of battle, or the cruelties inflicted by savages upon their victims; but all of these, added together, are finite, and the sufferings of a single soul hereafter are infinite. That is to say, all the pain and evil of this world, resulting from all human sin, through all time, is infinitely small and insignificant when compared with the punishment endured by a single soul hereafter for his share of that sin. And all this is inflicted by God; and he is a God of love.

There are some doctrines, the statement of which is their refutation. This, we think, is one of them.

But it must also be considered, that this doctrine, which throws such darkness over the future, also sends down a rayless night over the present. It refutes every theodicee: it nullifies every solution of evil. The consolation for the sufferings of this world is, that the fashion of this world passes away, and that there is a better world to come. The explanation of the evils of this life is, that they are finite; and that they are, therefore, to be swallowed up and to disappear in an infinite good. The Christian finds relief, in considering the sufferings of this world, by regarding them as the means of a greater ultimate joy; by looking forward to the time when all tears shall be wiped away; and by a firm faith that love is stronger than selfishness,

good stronger than evil. But the doctrine of eternal punishment gives us, in the condition of a single lost soul, a greater amount of evil hereafter than all the evil, which is to be thus explained, here; and the myriads of lost souls, each of which is to suffer infinitely more than all the sufferings of the present world, present us with a problem in the future, so appalling that the problem of present evil, vast as it is, becomes insignificant by its side.

We are tormented with evil here. We seek a solution of the problem: we find it in the limited, finite, and ancillary nature of evil. But that solution is wholly taken away when we are told that evil is infinite and eternal.

Against such a view of future punishment, there are certainly grave antecedent objections, on grounds both of reason and of Scripture. The burden of proof is upon those who believe and teach it. It is a doctrine shocking to the common sense and common humanity of the world. It seems to impute injustice and cruelty to the Infinite Father: it seems to stand in contradiction to the idea of God given us by Christ. It cannot be defended by argument: it must rest, one would think, entirely on the basis of Scripture. There are a few passages of Scripture, which seem at first sight, and in their literal signification, to teach it: were it not for these, it certainly would not be believed. It becomes us, therefore, carefully to examine these passages, and see what they really teach; and we shall do this before concluding the present article. But we will first examine the tract of a distinguished divine, and defender of the doctrine, preached and printed a year or two since in Boston.

When, a year or two since, we heard that Dr. Nehemiah Adams was advertised to preach on the reasonableness of endless punishment, we thought how every one's idea of God determines, not only all his theology, but all his

morality, all his ethics, physics, and metaphysics. We know many men who believe in endless punishment, because they think the Bible teaches it, word for word; but then they do not pretend to reason about it, and find it accordant with the theory of the universe. They believe it because *they must*, on the *ipse dixit* of the New Testament. But here is a man to whom it seems, not an awful mystery, but a beautifully wise arrangement, that some of Eve's children should be for ever howling in torment, while others are enjoying peace, glory, and infinite good. It is the structure of his mind to think so. We do not understand him to say that his reason would have demanded endless punishment, if the Scripture had said nothing about it; but merely that, being revealed, he now finds it in harmony with his idea of God, Christ, man, sin, and the gospel.

We will examine Dr. Adams's tract on "The Reasonableness of Eternal Future Punishment."

We have only these three chief objections to it: —

1. It, throughout, denies the sovereignty of God.

2. It is, throughout, a system of materialism.

3. It, throughout, ignores the central truth of the gospel.

It is our business to substantiate these assertions by sufficient proof.

1. The view taken in his tract, of God, cannot be true, because it conflicts with his supreme and sovereign deity.

Of course, this is to dethrone God. God, if not sovereign, is not God. Any view which disturbs, however remotely, the supremacy of the Deity, must be a relapse toward Pagan idolatry. We charge this tendency on the whole tenor of this tract. We affirm that it seriously impairs that confidence and strength which can only come from reliance on Omnipotence, and remands us to the terrors and narrowness of Polytheism; not consciously, of course,

or intentionally, but by the logic of its ideas and the tendency of its argument.

According to Dr. Adams's view of the world, it is a scene of conflict between God and the Devil. The prize contended for is the souls of men. God wishes to save them: the Devil wishes to damn them. By immense efforts, — by the unparalleled sacrifice of himself on the cross, — God succeeds in saving a portion of this race whom the Devil had plunged into fearful and desperate sin. As for the rest, He can do nothing with them, but must go away and leave them; escaping with the saved to some other region, where the sin and misery of the rest may be lost sight of.

The only divine supremacy which Dr. Adams admits is that of force. God is, on the whole, *stronger* than the Devil; so that He can prevent him from carrying his ravages beyond certain limits. God can "hem in and overrule" the power of sin; but he cannot conquer it. He has no complete power over the heart and will of men to become supreme there; but he has power over their conduct, and can restrain that within certain limits.

God's sovereignty, according to Dr. Adams, is only like that of a human government, and that, again, a weak one. A human government is strong when it is able to dispense with standing armies, with an omnipresent police, with prisons and dungeons: it is weak when its authority is only maintained by these. In the first case, it rests on the love of the people; in the other case, only on force.

Now, according to Dr. Adams's tract, God's sovereignty is essentially one of force. He is not sovereign by overcoming sin through his own holiness, but only by restraining its outbreaks by externally applied force. So far from conquering sin, he is represented as giving up all hope of conquering it. He has tried every thing in his power,

and has failed. He can do nothing more. Dr. Adams speaks of God's "having expended upon us all which the gospel of his grace includes," and of "the failure of that which is the brightness of his glory." Now, Dr. Adams says, "What God will probably do is, to go away and leave us." God says, according to the idea of this tract, "I will place all of you, who sin, in a world by yourselves, from which I and my friends will for ever withdraw." In substance, He gives up, and acknowledges himself defeated. He is beaten by sin, which is more powerful than his gospel. Sin compels the Deity to compromise; to take some souls, and to leave others; to divide the universe, — love reigning in one part of it, hatred and wickedness in another.

The second objection to the doctrine of everlasting punishment, as taught in these works, is, that it is a system of pure Materialism. It is Naturalism as opposed to Supernaturalism. All its arguments from Scripture interpret Scripture according to its letter, and not according to its spirit. While much stress is laid on the word "eternal," no real eternity is believed in, or even conceived of. The fundamental law of religious knowledge — namely, that a man must be born of the Spirit in order to see the kingdom of God, and that spiritual things must be spiritually discerned — is wholly lost sight of. The spiritual world, with its bliss and its woe, is supposed to be a continuation of the natural world, instead of being its exact opposite. The same conditions of space and time are supposed to prevail there as here. Hell is regarded by Dr. Adams as a large place, located in some remote part of the universe, where the sufferings and blasphemies of damned souls and devils will not disturb the sentimental happiness of himself and his pious companions. Eternity he regards as an enormous and quite inconceivable accumulation of time, instead

of being the very negation of time. An unlimited quantity of days, months, and years, is his notion of eternity.

In like manner, all the arguments by which the school to which he belongs maintains this doctrine are drawn from relations which exist in this world. Great use is made of the analogies of human government. It is said that it would not be safe for the Deity to forgive sins on the simple condition of repentance, without an atonement, because it would not be safe for human governments to do so. The government of God is made wholly similar to the imperfect and ignorant governments of men. When we say that God, as described in the New Testament, is not a Being to inflict everlasting suffering hereafter, we are told that he inflicts suffering here ; as though there were no essential distinction between the finite and the infinite, the temporal and the eternal. When we argue that God would not suspend the eternal destiny of a soul upon the conduct and the determination of a brief earthly life, we have instances given us of great risks to which we are exposed, and great evils which we may incur, in this world ; as though there were no difference between a partial loss and total destruction. When we say that the justice of God will not permit him to punish everlastingly those who, like the Heathen, have never known Christ, we have instances given of those who have ignorantly burned themselves or have fallen down precipices. In all such examples, these reasoners overlook the essential distinction between the finite and the infinite. They forget that all finite evil can be made the means of a greater ultimate good, but that infinite evil cannot.

It is a curious fact, that those who are most Orthodox fall most easily into a very hard and dry Naturalism. God is to them a King sitting on a throne in some far heaven outside of the world, not a Spirit pervading it

and sustaining it. He governs men from without by offering them rewards and threatening them with punishments, not by inward inspirations and influence. He teaches them from without by an outward Christ, an outward Bible, outward preachers, pulpits, creeds, sabbaths, and churches; not by Christ formed within us, not by epistles and gospels written on the fleshly tables of the heart. The day of judgment is a particular time, when God shall sit on his throne, and all appear before him; not the perpetual spiritual sentence pronounced in each human soul by the divine law. And so heaven is a place where there is to be some singing of psalms, and such amusements as are here considered proper in Orthodox families; hell, another place, where souls are shut up, to suffer from physical fire, or at least from some external infliction. The doctrine taught by the Saviour in the first twelve verses of his first sermon, that the humble, the generous, the merciful, are already blessed, and have heaven now, does not appear to be at all comprehended. That heaven and hell are in this world already; that truth, love, and use are its essence, whilst falsehood and selfishness are the essence of hell, — these, though rudimental facts of Christianity, are commonly considered mere mysticism. But those who do not see all this have not seen the kingdom of Heaven, and must be born again, into a new world of spiritual ideas, in order to see it.

The third and principal argument against the doctrine of everlasting punishment is, that it is *inconsistent with the Divine Love to his creatures.* It is impossible for God to manifest love to a human being by inflicting everlasting torment upon him. It cannot do him good, because, according to this theory, the period of probation is past, and he has no power now to repent. As far, therefore, as the man himself is concerned, it is gratuitous suffering, — torment inflicted

without any purpose. It cannot be said that God has any love for the soul which he is treating in this way. He has cast it off. To that soul, nevermore, throughout the ages of an everlasting existence, shall God appear as a friend, but always as an enemy.

We sometimes hear of a father who disinherits a child in consequence of some act of disobedience. In one of the most touching tragedies in the English language, a father refuses to forgive his daughter who had married contrary to his wishes. He leaves her to starve, and refuses to forgive her or to see her. No one approves of this conduct in the parent. But every Orthodox man, who believes in everlasting punishment, attributes an infinitely greater cruelty to God: infinitely greater, because the obstinacy of the human parent endures only during a short life, but the severity of God endures for ever.

The force of this objection is such, that Dr. Adams has felt obliged to add to his tract on "Everlasting Punishment" another tract upon the text, "God is love," endeavoring to show a consistency between the two. But he does this by substituting something else in the place of the last. It is curious enough, that a master in Israel should have written a tract upon the "love" of God, and should have substituted "benevolence" instead of it. In other words, instead of that fatherly love to every individual which is the essential fact revealed in the gospel, he gives us a general good-will toward the human race. Such a general benevolence he finds not inconsistent with the doctrine of everlasting punishment; for, if love be only general good-will, then, the greatest good of the greatest number being the object, there is nothing to complain of if a few are sacrificed for the sake of the rest. It is not, to be sure, easy to see how those who have safely reached glory, and are in no danger of relapse, can be benefited by the know-

ledge that their old neighbors and friends are in hell; but there may be some benefit which is not apparent. By quietly substituting, therefore, the idea of benevolence in the place of love, the difficulty may be evaded, which otherwise is unanswerable.

But what an entire confusion of ideas is this, which substitutes a general benevolence for a personal affection, goodwill toward the race for love to the individual! It is, in fact, abolishing the idea of Father, and substituting that of Ruler. The kind ruler, actuated by benevolence, desires the good of all his subjects; but he does not love them as individuals. But the father loves the child with a wholly different feeling. The tie is personal, not general. It is one of mutual knowledge and mutual dependence. We cannot love one whom we do not know; but we can exercise benevolence toward him very easily. Benevolence depends wholly on the character of the benevolent person; but love is drawn out by the object loved. I do not love my child because I am benevolent, but because it is my child. The infant draws forth a host of feelings, before unknown, in the mother's heart. She does not love her infant because she is a benevolent lady, but because the infant excites her love. A man is benevolent toward the sufferers in Kansas, whom he has never seen; but he does not love them. He loves his wife, but is not benevolent toward her. Benevolence and love, therefore, are not only essentially different in their nature, origin, and manifestations, but so different as often to exclude each other.

Now, it has always been seen that God is benevolent. This is taught by natural religion. We see it in all the arrangements of Divine Providence. The infinitely varied provisions for the good of his creatures, the myriad adaptations by which their wants are met, are ample evidence of this. But Christianity comes to teach us something else,

— to teach us that God is our Father, and so to see in him benevolence swallowed up in love. God does not love his children because he is benevolent, but because they are his children. He does not love them for the sake of others, but for their own sake. His love does not depend upon their being good, pious, or Christian: it depends only upon the fact that they are his children. This is the doctrine of the prodigal son; in which wonderful parable it is more distinctly stated than in any other part of the New Testament. The doctrine there taught, that there is more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents than over ninety and nine just persons who need no repentance, is somewhat different from that other doctrine, that the redeemed in heaven look down with joy upon the sufferings of the damned below. This parable teaches that God has a personal, fatherly love toward the impenitent sinner who has gone away from him into a far country. The father's joy when his child returned is the evidence of the love which had continued in his heart while his child was absent from him.

This being the character ascribed by Christ to the Deity, we assert that it is wholly inconsistent with the doctrine of everlasting punishment as taught in the pamphlet before us. There are, it is true, many widely different doctrines to which the term "eternal punishment" is applied. Some of these may not be inconsistent with the love of God. Let us give some instances.

Some, by eternal punishment, intend the punishments of eternity, as distinguished from those of time. They mean spiritual punishment, as distinguished from temporal punishment. They mean the sufferings which have their root in the sight of eternal things, as distinguished from those which originate in the sense of earthly things, — sufferings which come to us from within, and not from without.

"Eternal," in this sense, describes the quality, and not the quantity, of the suffering; and, in this sense, eternal punishment is not inconsistent with the Divine Love. But this is not the sense which Dr. Adams intends.

Some mean by endless punishment, that, as long as men continue to sin, they will continue to suffer; that sin is eternally suffering. But this is not the sense which Dr. Adams intends.

And some say that they believe in eternal punishment: meaning thereby, that the consequences of sin are everlasting, — either positively, by leaving for ever some remorseful sorrow in the mind; or, negatively, by leaving men for ever lower down in the scale of excellence and happiness than they would otherwise be. But this is not what Dr. Adams means by it.

And some men believe in eternal punishment in the sense of a dark background to the universe, which will always continue, a shadow as permanent as light, — necessary for the full perfection and beauty of an infinite divine creation. Into this shadow man may for ever plunge; out of it he may for ever emerge: and it will always continue so to be. But this is not the view taken by Dr. Adams.

The view which Dr. Adams takes is of endless punishment inflicted as a consequence of temporal sin committed in this life. There will be no opportunity to repent hereafter, no pardon offered. There is nothing done by God, after this life, to save men. The Heathen who have never heard of Christ, unconverted infants, those who have been brought up in the midst of evil, and heretics who do not accept the theory of Calvin concerning Christianity, are to be tormented for ever in the other world. This view he thinks not only scriptural, but reasonable. It corresponds nearly to the human penalty of imprisonment for life; except that, instead of a few years of earthly life, it is a

never-ending existence; and, instead of simple imprisonment, it is imprisonment with torture added.

We are accustomed to complain of the "horrors of the Inquisition;" but wherein do they differ in principle from the doctrine of Dr. Adams? The inquisitors tortured men for heresy: Dr. Adams thinks that God will do the same. The power of the Inquisition, however, was limited, on the principle, *Dolor, si dura, brevis; si longa, levis.* But not so with everlasting punishment.

That this view is absolutely inconsistent with the fatherly love of God to every soul, is apparent. It would be impossible for a father to torment his child for ever in consequence of temporal sin. No earthly parent could be found cruel enough to inflict a million years of torture upon his child for each sin committed by him; but a million years for every sinful action would be but a trifling penalty compared with everlasting punishment.

As it is absolutely impossible to defend this doctrine on the ground of the fatherly love of God, it is defended by Dr. Adams and his companions on other grounds; namely, of the Divine Benevolence, and the duty of God as a Governor. The argument is this: If God was dethroned, all sorts of evil would ensue. But sin is always endeavoring to dethrone God: therefore it is his duty to use the most strenuous measures to prevent this result. These strenuous measures consist in the highest rewards offered to obedience, and the severest punishments threatened to disobedience. But no punishment is so severe as everlasting punishment: therefore the benevolence of God requires him to threaten it; and, if threatened, his truth requires him to inflict it. This is the sort of argument by which the doctrine is defended. Its fallacies are manifest. It is based on a sort of Manicheism, making evil a hostile power in the universe, which threatens the supremacy of

God. It makes God in danger of outward overthrow in consequence of the external assaults of sin. But we have always supposed that the essence of sin was the state of the heart, and the evil of sin to consist in the estrangement of the heart from God, and not in any danger that Omnipotence would be dethroned by it. Besides, though the fear of future punishment may restrain the outward act, it cannot change the heart; and cannot, therefore, remove the real evil of sin. Here is the fallacy of this whole argument.

Another weak point in the argument for everlasting punishment consists in the proof, that all opportunity for repentance is confined to this life. Only two or three texts are quoted in proof of this very important position. One is taken from the Book of Ecclesiastes, and declares, that, "in the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be:" of which there is no evidence that it has any relation to the subject; or, if it has, that it carries the least authority with it. Another passage asserts that "there is no work nor desire nor knowledge nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest." But this would prove too much; for it would prove that there was no knowledge in the other life. Another passage, quoted by Dr. Adams from the Book of Revelation, says, "Let him that is unjust be unjust still;" from which it is inferred that men have no opportunity hereafter for repentance. But, as this is said to those who are in *this* world waiting for the coming of Christ, it also proves too much, if taken literally; since it would declare that men cannot repent even in this world. Such is the extremely slight foundation on which this essential part of the doctrine is made to rest. Never was there so weak a support for so important a position.

The arguments from reason, by which our writer supports this part of his doctrine, are all taken from the plane

of the lowest Naturalism. He thinks it reasonable that the Almighty should suspend the everlasting destiny of his creatures upon what they do or omit doing in this life, because men, in earthly transactions, adopt a similar principle. A railroad train is advertised to start at a certain hour. If we are there a minute too late, we lose our opportunity of going on an important journey. We think this reasonable: why, then, argues Dr. Adams, should we think it unreasonable for God to make us lose our chance throughout eternity if we do not take the opportunity during life? God has given us full notice, he says, of his intention; we have been duly notified; and, after due notice, it is thought reasonable, in earthly business transactions, for people to run their chance. A man may commit a crime in a minute, for which he is sentenced to imprisonment for life or to capital punishment. We think this reasonable: why should we think it unreasonable that God should send men to an everlasting hell in consequence of sin committed in a short lifetime?

All these arguments are fallacious, because they apply, to the Infinite, conditions belonging wholly to the finite; because they transfer to Him, whose ways are not as our ways and whose thoughts are not as our thoughts, the poor necessities of human ignorance and weakness. To those who reason thus, the Almighty may say, "Thou thoughtest me altogether such a one as thou thyself." It is because man is weak and ignorant that he is obliged to live under these limitations. If we were able to do differently, we should not make such severe consequences flow from human ignorance and weakness. We do such things, not because we think them absolutely just and good, but because we cannot help it. To argue, that, because it is reasonable for human weakness to do something which it cannot help, it is reasonable for Divine Omnipotence to

do an infinitely more injurious thing of the same kind, is to fly in the face of all logic and reason.

Men make a rule, that, if I am not at the station when the train starts, I shall lose my trip for that day. Yes; but suppose the rule should be, that, if I arrived a moment too late, I should be crucified. Suppose a father should give full notice to his children, that, whenever any of them mispronounced a word, he should be burnt alive. But it is easier, according to Dr. Adams's thory, for a child never to make a mistake, than not to commit the sins for which it is to be punished with everlasting torment. "What man among you is there, being a father," who would cause his children to come into the world exposed to such fearful risks; who would allow them to be born with constitutions tending inevitably to sin, the inevitable consequence of which, after a few short years of life, is never-ending torment, the only possible escape from which is salvation through a Being of whom the majority never heard, according to a system which the majority cannot believe, and by a process, which, except by a special help, none of them are able to accomplish? We should say, that *we* would not have children under these conditions. It were better that such children had never been born. If we then, being evil, would not subject our children to such risk, how much less would our Father in heaven do any thing of the kind!

The reply to such arguments, by those whom Thomas Burnet calls the "unmerciful doctors" and "ferocious theologians," is always the same. Because finite evil exists, and is not inconsistent with the divine plan, therefore infinite evil may also exist, and not be inconsistent with the divine plan. Because one may suffer for a time in this world, therefore he may be compelled to suffer for ever in the other world. It is assumed that there is no essential distinction between time and eternity, between finite and

infinite evil. Here is the immense fallacy of the argument. The difference is simply this: All finite *suffering*, however great, is as nothing when compared with everlasting happiness afterward; but all finite *happiness*, however great, is as nothing when compared with everlasting suffering afterward. If we deny, therefore, the doctrine of everlasting suffering, evil virtually disappears from the universe: if we accept it, good virtually disappears, as far as the sufferers are concerned. If all evil is finite, the goodness of God can be fully justified; but, if to any one it is infinite, no such theodicy is possible.

This is the fatal objection to the doctrine of everlasting punishment. It clouds the face of the heavenly Father with impenetrable gloom. It takes away the best consolations of the gospel. When Jesus tells us to forgive our enemies, that we may be like our heavenly Father, who sends his blessings upon the evil and the good, this doctrine adds, that God's character is thus forgiving only in this world; but that, in the other world, he will torment his enemies for ever in hopeless suffering. When we seek consolation amid the griefs and separations of this world by looking to a better world, where all tears will be wiped away, we have presented to us instead this awful vision of unmitigated horror. Instead of finite evil being swallowed up into infinite good, it darkens down into infinite woe.

Dr. Adams quotes Thomas Burnet, Master of the Charter-house, as a striking instance of one, who, though he denied or doubted this doctrine, admitted, nevertheless, that the Scriptures were probably against him. He quotes him correctly as saying, "Human nature shrinks from the very name of eternal punishment; yet the Scriptures seem to hold the other side." Though Dr. Adams gives the Latin, and refers to the page of the book, let us hope, for his own sake, that he quotes it at second-hand; which, as he twice

misspells the name, is not unlikely: for Dr. Burnet, so far from admitting that the Scriptures are "probably against him," concludes, after an examination of the leading passages, that they prove nothing certainly as to the eternal duration of future punishment. He quotes the passage in which the Jewish servant is said to become a slave *for ever*, — meaning till the year of jubilee; in which circumcision is called an *everlasting covenant*, — meaning that it shall be abolished by the same divine authority; in which the land of Canaan was given for an *everlasting possession* to Abraham and his seed, from which they have long since been expelled; &c. Dr. Burnet does, indeed, say that the Scriptures *seem* to favor the doctrine he opposes; but he then goes on to show that such is not the case. He also "awakens antiquity," and calls to his aid the merciful doctors of the early church (Justin Martyr, Jerome, the Gregories, &c.) to support his hope in a merely limited future suffering.

We will now consider the meaning of some of the texts usually adduced in support of this doctrine. Of these texts, there are some six or seven only upon which much stress is laid; and of these the principal ones are as follows: —

1. Matt. xviii. 8: "Having two eyes, two hands," &c., "to be cast into hell-fire," or "into everlasting fire" (*τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον*) — (*τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός*).

2. Matt. xxv. 46: "These shall go away into everlasting (eternal) punishment; but the righteous, into life eternal (*κόλασιν αἰνιον*) and (*ζωὴν αἰώνιον*). The same adjective is used in both places here, in the Greek; but our translators have seen fit to render it "everlasting" in the first place, and "eternal" in the second. There is no authority for such a different translation. The word *κόλασις*,

translated "punishment," occurs in one other place in the New Testament; this is (1 John iv. 18): "Perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath torment." In this last instance, it is evident that the idea of punishment is not found; but only that of suffering. In the LXX. (Ezek. xiv. 3, 4, 7), it is translated "stumbling-block," and means, says Schleusner (Lexicon in LXX.), "all that is the source of misfortune or suffering." Donnegan gives as its meaning, "the act of clipping or pruning; *generally*, restriction, restraint, reproof, check, chastisement; *lit. and met.*, punishment."

The true translation of the passage, then, is:—

"These shall go away into the sufferings or punishments of eternity; and the righteous, into the life of eternity."

The simple, direct, and natural meaning, therefore, of this passage is, that, besides temporal joy and suffering, there is eternal joy and suffering: beside the joys and sufferings which have their root in time and in temporal things, there are joys and sufferings which have their root in eternity and in eternal things. In the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew, the sufferings of eternity are described as following directly upon judgment, and as being its natural consequence. The judgment on each soul consists, according to this passage, in showing it its real character. Both the good and the bad are represented as needing such a judgment as this. Until the judgment takes place, men are described as being ignorant of the true nature of their own past conduct. They do not know their own good or their own evil: they do not understand themselves as they really are. They have done good and bad actions, but have not understood the value of those actions. They have not seen, that in every deed of charity, in every act of humble benevolence, they were helping Christ and his cause. They have not understood, that, by every selfish and cruel deed,

they were injuring their Master. But the judgment reveals all this to them, and lifts them immediately out of temporal joy and pain into eternal joy and pain. They rise out of temporal things into eternal things, and the new insight is to them a source of spiritual joy or spiritual suffering.

This is the natural meaning of the text. There is no idea conveyed, in either case, concerning the duration of suffering or joy: it is the kind of life, not the duration of life; the kind of suffering, not the duration of suffering.

This view becomes very evident, when we compare with this passage the other passages where the noun *αἰών* and the adjective *αἰώνιος* occur in the New Testament. The phrase "eternal life," as we know, occurs often in the New Testament, especially in the Gospel of John. Now, this term, "eternal life," usually means, not never-ending existence, nor never-ending happy existence, but a present spiritual state of the soul. Take a few instances of this: —

John iii. 36: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life."

John iv. 14: "The water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life."

John vi. 47: "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life."

John xvii. 3: "This is life eternal, that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."

Gal. vi. 8: "Shall of the spirit reap life everlasting."

1 Tim. vi. 12: "Fight the good fight of faith; lay hold on eternal life."

In all these cases, "eternal life" evidently refers to the present religious state of the soul, not to any future out-

ward condition. It is an inward life which is described, not an outward one; a present life, and not a future one. When it is said (Rom. ii. 7) that God will give eternal life to those who, by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, honor, and immortality, the meaning, surely, is, not that he will give them a life which cannot end, but rather that he will give them a life having a heavenly or spiritual nature. The spring of water in the soul, which Christ promises, wells up constantly into present spiritual joy; not into future, never-ending being.

In some instances, if *αἰώνιος* were translated "everlasting" or "never-ending," it would make such palpable nonsense, that our translators have been obliged to give it an entirely different rendering. Thus (2 Tim. i. 9; Tit. i. 2) we have the phrase *πρὸ κρόνων αἰωνιων;* which would be, literally, "before eternity," or "before everlasting time began," according to the common rendering. They have, therefore, translated it "before the world began." In the same way (Matt. xxiv. 3; 1 Cor. x. 11), they are obliged to change their usual rendering, or they would have to say, "So shall it be at the end of for ever;" or, "The ends of eternity have arrived."

Mark ix. 43–50, it is said that the "worm does not die" in Gehenna, and "the fire is not quenched." This, therefore, is thought to teach the doctrine of never-ending punishment hereafter; but this was a proverbial expression, taken from the Book of Isaiah.

Chap. lxvi. 24, the prophet says, that, in the times of the Messiah, all men shall come, and worship in the presence of Jehovah; and shall then go out, and look upon the dead bodies of the men who had transgressed against the Lord: "For their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." Our Saviour, therefore, is not making an

original doctrinal statement ; but he is quoting from Isaiah. Now, the passage in Isaiah refers, not to punishment of the soul hereafter, but to the destruction of the bodies of transgressors in the Valley of Hinnom. The fire and the worms in that valley were not everlasting in any strict sense. When Isaiah says, "Their worm shall not die, nor their fire be quenched," he expresses merely the utter destruction which would fall upon them. The fire and the worms of the Valley of Hinnom have long since disappeared; but, while the fire lasted, it was the emblem, to the Jews, of the destruction which was to fall upon those who resisted the will of Jehovah. But it is not to be supposed that the idea of eternity, which is not in the original image, should be added in the figure. The fire and the worms were to last in the Valley of Hinnom as long as there were idolaters to be punished for their idolatry; and so the spiritual suffering consequent upon sin lasts as long as sin lasts. Sin is perpetual misery ; conscience is a worm which never dies; bad passions are a fire which is never extinguished. This is the simple and natural meaning of this passage.

3. Matt. xxvi. 24. — In this passage, as it stands in our translation, Jesus says concerning Judas, "Woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! It were good for that man if he had never been born" (Mark xiv. 21). The argument is, that, if it were good for Judas not to have been born, it must be impossible that he should ever repent and be saved: because, if he should ever be saved, and his punishment should cease (though at ever so remote a period), it would be better for him to have been born than not to have been born; since there would remain an eternity of happiness to be enjoyed afterward. And, if this be true of Judas, it may be also true of others.

But, in reply to this argument, we say, —

1. The translation is doubtful. The literal translation is, "Woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! It had been good for him if that man had never been born." This is the literal rendering of the Greek; and the apparent meaning seems to be, "that it had been good for the Son of man if Judas had not been born." Jesus seems to say that it is a great woe to him, a great sorrow, to be betrayed by one of his own friends, by a member of his own household. It would have been good for Jesus, if this traitor, who was to wound his heart so deeply, had never existed.

2. But, retaining our present translation, the natural application of it is to this life. It means simply this: The earthly life of this man is an entire failure. His life is wholly thrown away. He had better never have been in the world, than to stand, as he will to all time, a monument of the basest treachery. The idea of the future life does not come in at all here.

We have thus gone briefly over some of the leading points of this discussion. Our objections have been taken from the Christian stand-point. We are believers in the divine humanity of the Lord Jesus. We are also believers in the full (though not infallible) inspiration of the New Testament. It is because Dr. Adams's system (so far as he has one) tends to rationalism, materialism, and infidelity, that we oppose it. We contend with him in the interests of belief, and by no means in those of unbelief.

Perhaps Dr. Adams will say (if he reads this article) that we have misunderstood him, misrepresented him, and possibly that we have abused him. Such is often the complaint of one frankly opposed and exposed by an honest criticism. Perhaps he will add, that our writing is beneath refutation, and that his friends have advised him to take no notice of it. Such is sometimes his custom,

when pressed by weighty, and possibly unanswerable, argument. But we may be permitted to say, that we have no desire to misrepresent or to abuse him. We hear that, in private, Dr. Adams is an amiable man, and much esteemed in the domestic circle. We should never wish to interfere with the smooth flow of his life, if he would abstain from printing what seems to us false and dangerous doctrine.

Perhaps, as a sufficient answer to all we say, he may declare us to be Abolitionists. That may or may not be; but not on that account do we criticize his theology. We have no grudge against him on account of his "Southside" book, bad as it was. We can now understand better why he should have written it. Do men gather grapes of thorns? A theology like his could scarcely result in any humane ethics. Not recognizing God (in any real sense) as a Father, he cannot regard man as a brother. In this sense, his proslavery and inhuman book was a prophylactic. It was an antidote to his theology, administered beforehand. It was an effectual *reductio ad absurdum* of his unchristian doctrines.

On the whole, one must feel, in reading these books and tracts, that Dr. Adams is much more to be pitied than to be blamed. Confined in the strait-jacket of an austere theology; steeped to the lips in Calvinism; working painfully all his life in sectarian harness; with an angry heaven over his head, and a ruined earth about his feet; his friends and neighbors dropping into hell by thousands every year; never having had any real sight of the blessed face of Jesus; having for them no hope full of immortality, but, instead thereof, a terror full of damnation, — even a kindly nature and an affectionate heart must suffer, be dwarfed and crippled.

It is not an agreeable task to refute such errors; but

believing them equally destructive, in their tendency, to piety and morality, — corrupting the Christian life at its centre, and weakening its chief source of power, — we feel it a duty not to be avoided. Advancing age does not make us conservative in regard to such doctrines. The longer we live, the more we see of their evil tendency. When young, we shrank from attacking them, fearing lest they might contain some truth beyond the range of our limited experience. But, having come to see wherein the essence of Christian truth lies in all varieties of pious experience, we know that this doctrine is an excrescence, weakening always the vital power of the gospel. It rests on custom, on cowardice, on the fear of change; not on any positive insight or substantial knowledge. But, as Tertullian declared of another doctrine defended by precedent, "Christ did not say, 'I am the Custom,' but 'I am the Truth.'"

The time will come in which the Christian Church will look back upon its past belief in this doctrine as it looks back now on its former universal belief in the duty of persecution, the primacy of the Pope, or the Atonement made by Christ to Satan. It will regard it with the horror with which it now regards its former universal conviction, that God was pleased when his children burnt each other alive for difference of opinion. We now shudder when we hear of "An Act of Faith," consisting in burning at the stake ten or twenty Jews and Protestants. Our children will shudder with a still more inward grief that we could make it *an act of faith* to believe that God burns millions of his own children in unquenchable fire for ever because they deny Calvin's view of the Atonement or the Church definition of the Trinity, or because of any possible amount of sin committed in this world.

## MRS. JOHN W. SULLIVAN.

The lady whose name stands at the head of the page died in Brookline, in the month of July, last year. For several reasons, we think it well to give a brief notice of this excellent woman, as we have noticed in former pages such persons as Mrs. Follen and Mrs. Fuller. Where a person is known in any way to the public, has a large circle of friends, has had peculiar mental or moral experiences, or is distinguished by any thing remarkable in character or in action, then, if the Christian element of faith and piety is strong, some notice of such a one is edifying. Mrs. Sullivan had many friends, and was widely known by her musical compositions and some popular lyrical poetry. We have, therefore, thought a notice of her character appropriate to our "Journal," especially as there is something significant and instructive in one of the last acts of her life; namely, her change of church-relations. A year or two before her death, Mrs. Sullivan and her daughter left the church of Dr. Kirk, of which they had been members for some years, and afterward united with the Church of the Disciples. The remarkable feature in this act was, that it was not in consequence of any change of doctrinal opinion, but because they felt themselves more at home in the latter place than in the other: the religious atmosphere in one place was better suited, in their judgment, to feed their religious nature, than that of the other. In consequence of this withdrawal, Mrs. Sullivan and her daughter were excommunicated by the Mount-Vernon Church; but they made no complaint, but bore it patiently, and found that it did them very little harm.

MARION M. DIX was the fourth daughter of Col. Timothy Dix. She was born in her father's house in Boscawen, N.H.; and in that wild and beautiful region she lived until the time of his death, growing up with that love of the beautiful in nature which was so strong a feeling with her through life.

At an early age she removed with her family to Littleton, Mass.; from which place she was married to Mr. John W. Sullivan, and came to live in Boston. During her early married life she often wrote articles of prose and poetry for the press, particularly for Buckingham's "New-England Magazine" and Mrs. Hale's "Ladies' Magazine." But it is by her talents as a musical composer and teacher that she is best known out of the immediate circle of her family and friends.

Dear as she was in those homes where she visited socially, — dear from her gentle sweetness, her ready sympathy, her quick perceptions of every thing beautiful and amusing; revered as she was in many a dark haunt of poverty and sickness, where her womanly tenderness and her frequent benefactions endeared her, — it is through her songs that she will be longest remembered. When the destitute families whom her charity never forgot are broken up; when the gay picture-books she always distributed at Christmas-time among all the poor children of her acquaintance are worn out and destroyed; when the little motherless one whom her kindness rescued from saddest want, and protected until she found for it a happy home, has lost all remembrance of other than its now luxurious surroundings; when the poor artists and exiles who found encouragement, hospitality, and aid from her, have joined her in the next world, — her "Blue Juniata" will still be sung and loved; "The Field of Monterey" will still bring tears to the eyes

of every soldier's wife and mother; and "Marion Day" and "Mary Lindsey" and "The Good Physician" will still be among the household favorites all over our song-loving land.

Her contributions to sheet-music are very numerous; and she has, within a few years, published two volumes of "Songs," — "Juniata Ballads" and "Bible Songs," — which have been very favorably received, and are now doubly valuable as her closing labors. As a teacher of music, both vocal and instrumental, of the piano and the guitar, she was very industrious.

When her husband's business and health obliged him to be absent in the Sandwich Islands for a protracted time, she removed to Parkersburg, Va., from her temporary residence in Marietta, O.; and there supported herself, and educated her three little children, by her exertions as a music-teacher. Very many in those places, as among us, retain a loving remembrance of that mother, sensitive as brave, gentle as patient, courteous, winning, uniformly careful of wounding the feelings of the lowest, slow to condemn the vilest or to abandon the least encouraging, self-distrustful but self-sustained, strong in faith and love and feminine endurance. She lived a pure, a peaceful, and a useful life, blameless and beloved as daughter, wife, and mother.

When, two years ago, came the terrible tidings of the death of her only and dearly loved son, she reaped some of the fruits of her unvarying kindness. All who knew her mourned with her, and did all that could be done to comfort her in her bereavement. But, though borne with Christian sweetness, the blow was one from which she never wholly recovered. Her sorrow, restrained and hidden, wore upon her health, and may have contributed to

the sudden development of that disease of the heart (long latent, perhaps) which ended her life, after six weeks of great suffering, July 16, 1860.

Mrs. Sullivan was a person of great sensibility, which, accompanied with a diffidence of her own powers which was quite too excessive, sometimes concealed from others the vigor and clearness of her understanding. People saw her poetic nature and her moral sensibility, but perhaps did not always notice that these were joined with a very sound and healthy intellect. Her judgments of character were quite acute and judicious. Although Orthodox in her opinions, and believing, upon the whole, in the common doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement, she did not find herself edified by the preaching of those doctrines. The harsher administration of religion was unsuited to her nature, which needed love rather than fear. She was one of the sheep who know the Shepherd's voice, and follow him, and do not need to be driven before him. One would suppose that a case like this might have awakened the sympathies of a pastor, and that he would have said, "Go, then, where you can get the most good." Perhaps he did wish to say so; but the rules of the church were too inflexible to allow it. Mrs. Sullivan and her daughter first asked for a general dismission, with a recommendation to the church universal; but this was denied. After this, moving to Brookline, and thinking that they should probably attend the Episcopal Church, they received a letter of dismissal, addressed to the clerk of that body.

For it seems that it is the custom of the Orthodox Congregational churches, in dismissing their members, not only to give a letter of recommendation to a particular church, but to add another blank form, which is to be filled up and returned by the proper officer of the society which they join; thus: "Church A dismisses Brother X, with a letter of re-

commendation to Church B." When Mr. X joins Church B, the proper officer sends back the printed form, stating that fact. Then, and not before, Mr. X ceases to belong to Church A. In other words, no one who joins an Orthodox church can get out of it again, except by joining another. Such is Christian liberty in Massachusetts in 1860. Once a member of an Orthodox church, you must remain a member of one, or be excommunicated. You may change your religious opinions; or, without changing them, you may desire to join some other church, where you find nutriment better suited to the needs of your soul: but, unless that church is considered Orthodox, you are not allowed to do so. You can only go at the risk of being excommunicated. Such was the case with Mrs. Sullivan. The members of the Mount-Vernon Church felt very sorry at being obliged by their rules to cut her off: but they could not help themselves; for, instead of joining the church in Brookline, she deemed it her duty, in consequence of certain satisfactory reasons, to unite with another which they did not consider to belong to their fellowship; the reason being, as stated in the letter of the proper officer, that the church she joined was set down as Unitarian in the "Boston Directory." A more singular basis for an excommunication we can hardly conceive.

The sufferings of Mrs. Sullivan during her last illness were very great. For many weeks she was in almost constant pain, sometimes in great agony; but, during all this, her religious faith and hope expressed themselves continually in the most striking utterances. She constantly felt the presence of the Saviour, and her bedside seemed attended by angels. The record of her conversations during these weeks of terrible pain, kept by her husband, would, were we permitted to quote it, show a singularly heavenly frame of mind.

## ST. AUGUSTINE'S EXPLANATION OF JOHN XVII. 5, "GLORY OF CHRIST BEFORE THE WORLD WAS," THE SAME AS THAT OF UNITARIANS.

By George R. Noyes, D.D.,
Hancock Professor of Sacred Literature, Harvard University.

The interpretation of John xvii. 5 and 24, which is given by Lardner and others, has sometimes been stigmatized the *Socinian* interpretation, and a wresting of Scripture in the interest of a system. I send you, therefore, the exposition of these verses by theologians of no less eminence than St. Augustine and John Calvin; not because it is clearer or unsupported by better arguments than when given by Unitarians, but in order to show that it is dictated by no sectarian bias. Were it not for making the article too long, I might have sent you Calvin's explanation of the verse, "I and my Father are one," and other similar declarations in the tenth and seventeenth chapters, which is precisely the same as that given by Unitarians; but this will suffice at present.

### *St. Augustine's explanation of John* xvii. 5.

"What he says just before — 'And now glorify me' — has a bearing on this clause: that is, as *then*, so also *now;* as then by predestination, so also now by performance. Do in the world that which was with Thee *before* the world; do that in time which Thou didst decree before all time. Some have understood this prayer as if the human nature, which was assumed by the Word, was to be changed into the Word, and man be changed into God; nay, if we consider their opinion more carefully, that the man should *perish* in God. For no one would say, that, by that change of the man, either the Word of God was doubled or in-

creased, or that that which was formerly one became two, or that greater which was before less. Moreover, if the human nature, being changed into the Word, was to become as great as the Word of God was, and what it was, where would be *the man* if he did not perish?

"But to an opinion so inconsistent with the truth we are not driven, if, when the Son says, 'And now, Father, glorify me with thyself with the glory which I had with thee before the world was,' we understand him to mean the predestination of the glory of the human nature which is in him, which, from mortal, was to become immortal with the Father; and that that act had been already done by pre-predestination before the world was which should in its own time be done *in* the world. For if the apostle has said concerning us, 'As He hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world,' why should it be thought inconsistent with truth to maintain that the Father then glorified our Head when he chose us in him to be his members? for we were chosen in the same way in which he was glorified. Before the world was, we did not exist; nor did the Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, exist. But He, who by him, as his Word, made the things which were to be, and calls the things which are not as if they were, — even God the Father, — glorified him for us before the foundation of the world, if then he chose us in him.

"Perhaps some may hesitate to call *him* predestinated, because the apostle seems to say this of us only, that we may be conformed to his image: as if any one, who has regard to the analogy of faith, would deny that the Son of God is predestinated, who will not also deny that he was a man. True, he was not predestinated in so far as he was the Word, — God with God; for how could he be predestinated, since he was already that which he had been, — eter-

nal, without beginning and without end? But that which as yet did not exist was to be predestinated, so that, in its own time, it should so be as it was predestinated to be before all time. Whoever, therefore, denies that the Son of God was predestinated, denies also that he was the Son of man. But, on account of the contentious, let us also hear the apostle in the beginning of his Epistles; for in his first epistle (that to the Romans) he says at the beginning, 'Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, a called apostle, separated to the gospel of God (which he had before promised to his apostles in the Holy Scriptures), concerning his Son, who was made to him of the seed of David according to the flesh; but was predestinated the Son of God in power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by his resurrection from the dead.' According to this predestination, then, he was glorified before the world, that his glory might be, from or after the resurrection of the dead, with the Father, at whose right hand he sits. When, therefore, he saw that the time of his glorification had now come; that what had already taken place *in predestination* might now take place in *bestowal*, — he prayed, saying, 'And now, Father, glorify me with thyself with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.' As if he had said, 'The time has come when I, living at thy right hand, should receive the glory which I had with thee; that is, the glory which I had with thee in thy predestination.'" — *In Johannis Evang. Tr.* cvi.

In conformity with this explanation is that of verse 24, "For Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world;" which verse St. Augustine explains as meaning, "He loved *us in him* before the foundation of the world, and then did predestinate what he would do in the end of the world." — *In Johan. Tr.* cxi. In conformity with this is Calvin's explanation: "This also agrees far better to the

person of the Mediator than to the naked divinity of Christ. It is harsh to say that the Father loved his own wisdom. But the context prevents our adopting the latter meaning. There can be no doubt, that when Christ prayed, in a former verse, that the apostles might be with him where he was, and might behold the glory of his kingdom, he spake as the Head of the church, as he was. In this verse, he says that the love of the Father was the cause of this glory of his kingdom. Hence it follows that he was loved [before the world was,] inasmuch as he was predestinated to be the Redeemer of the world." — CALVIN *ad locum.*

---

## CHRISTIAN UNIONS.

*To the Editor of the Monthly Journal.*

YOUR suggestions for the establishment of Christian Unions, under the auspices of the American Unitarian Association, are worthy of particular attention, and should be put into practical operation. To this end, I herewith send a brief form of a Constitution for such bodies. This form will answer for either large or small Unions, but is more particularly adapted to neighborhoods where the Liberal Christians are few and have no regular society. The provision requiring at least one meeting to be held on each sabbath is designed to promote the usefulness of the Unions, and also to make them grow into permanent Liberal churches.

The establishment of such Unions is an important preliminary to systematic missionary action on the part of the Unitarian Association.

Some of these Unions might, perhaps, have ample pecuniary means, and yet be small in numbers; requiring, consequently, only occasional lectures or sermons from the agents of the Association.

Others might be large in numbers, but deficient in means; requiring, therefore, contributions in books, as well as frequent visits from the agents.

A large portion of the Liberal Christians in this country are scattered, away from the Liberal churches; and if the formation of such Unions shall aid in bringing them more frequently together, and also into more sympathetic relations with the American Unitarian Association, then a great and good work will be initiated.

W. H. W.

---

## CONSTITUTION.

### Article I. — Name.

This society shall be called "The Christian Union of . . . . ."

### Article II. — Objects.

The purpose of the Union shall be the religious, moral, and intellectual improvement of the members, and the promotion of pure Christianity.

### Article III. — Membership.

Any person desirous of co-operating in the objects of the Union may become a member upon signing the Constitution in the presence of one of the Directors, and upon paying the dues.

### Article IV. — Dues.

§ 1. The annual dues shall be . . . . dollars, payable semi-annually in advance.

§ 2. Members whose dues are in arrears three months shall forfeit membership, unless, by reason of their absence or inability, the Directors waive or postpone such forfeiture.

### Article V. — Officers and their Duties.

§ 1. The officers of the Union shall consist of a Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Corresponding Secretary, Recording Secretary, and Treasurer, who together shall constitute a Board of Directors. All of the officers shall be chosen annually by ballot, and hold their offices for one year, or until others are elected.

§ 2. The duties of the officers shall be such as usually pertain to their respective offices. The Board of Directors shall meet within one week after their election, and shall hold regular monthly meetings thereafter. Special meetings of the Board may be called at any time by the President, or any three Directors. The Corresponding Secretary of the Union shall serve as Secretary to the Board.

§ 3. The Board shall have general charge of the affairs and interests of the Union. They shall provide a suitable place of meeting, and cause the same to be properly furnished, warmed, and lighted; and institute and superintend such public exercises as will, in their judgment, promote the objects of the Union.

§ 4. The Chairman shall, at the annual meeting, present a Report of the condition and prospects of the Union. The Corresponding Secretary shall present a similar Report, semi-annually, to the American Unitarian Association; which Report shall include a list of the officers.

§ 5. The Treasurer shall have charge of the Constitution, receive the signatures of members, and collect the dues. He shall present to the Board a quarterly report, showing

the condition of the finances. No bills shall be paid by him without the approval of the Chairman, or a majority of the Directors.

### Article VI. — Vacancies.

Vacancies occurring in any of the offices shall be filled by vote of the Union; and the officers so chosen shall hold their offices until the next succeeding annual election.

### Article VII. — Committees.

The Board of Directors may appoint committees, charged with the execution, under the direction of the Board, of any duties devolving upon the Directors. Committees may also be appointed by the Union, whenever occasion requires.

### Article VIII. — Meetings.

At least one public meeting of the society, of a religious character, shall be held on each sabbath. At such meeting, a sermon or lecture shall be delivered or read, or a conference, or Sunday school, be held. The Directors may call such other religious meetings as they deem to be requisite and proper. The annual meeting, for the choice of officers and other business, shall be held on the . . . . day of . . . . . in each year. Other business-meetings may be called by the Chairman or Directors, or any five members.

### Article IX. — Debts.

No member or committee shall have power to contract any debt in the name of the Union, except by a vote of the Board of Directors; and the Directors shall have no authority to contract debts exceeding the annual income, except by a vote of the society.

### Article X. — Discipline.

Any member may, after a fair trial, be suspended or expelled by a vote of two-thirds of the members present at a special meeting.

Persistent violation of the Constitution, or Rules of Order, shall be sufficient ground for suspension or expulsion.

### Article XI. — Expression of Opinion.

At any conference, or meeting for discussion, each member shall be allowed the freest expression of opinion compatible with courtesy and the Rules of Order; but no vote shall be taken at any meeting upon any theoretical question, nor upon any subject except the practical or business affairs of the society.

### Article XII. — Order of Proceedings.

Rules of Order may be made by the society, regulating the proceedings at the meetings; and, until so made, the Directors shall prescribe and enforce such rules as they may deem to be necessary. The Chairman or Vice-Chairman, or one of the Directors, shall preside, or the Directors shall appoint a leader to preside, at any conference or similar meeting. The speakers at such meetings shall be limited to fifteen minutes each; but may, by unanimous consent, be permitted to continue. Any person not a member may be allowed to speak by request of the presiding officer or leader. All personal invective, and whatever is calculated to excite animosity, shall be out of order.

### Article XIII. — Amendments.

This Constitution shall not be altered or amended, except by the vote of two-thirds of the members present at a meeting specially called for the purpose, upon a notice of not less than fourteen days.

## BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

*Since our last Notice.*

*Ninth Report of the Unitarian Mission in India* for 1859 and 1860. Calcutta.

*Truth not to be Overthrown or Silenced:* a Sermon preached at Dorchester, Sunday, Jan. 27, 1861, by NATHANIEL HALL.

*Secession, Concession, or Self-possession: Which?* Walker, Wise, & Co. Price 15 cents.

*Tracts for the Times. American Dangers and Duties.* By Rev. A. D. MAYO, Albany.

*Ecclesiastical Excommunications:* a Sermon by WILLIAM H. FISH, Cortland, N.Y.

*Annual Report of the Board of Managers of the Temporary Home for Children*, No. 24, Kneeland Street, Boston.

*A Few Suggestions on the Personal-liberty Law*, &c. By Hon. B. F. THOMAS.

*Elsie Venner:* a Romance of Destiny. By OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, author of "The Autocrat of the Breakfast-table," &c. In two volumes. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1861.

*The Church Monthly.* Vol. 1, January, 1861, No. 1. Editors, Rev. GEORGE M. RANDALL, D.D., and Rev. F. D. HUNTINGTON, D.D. Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co.

*The Life of Trust:* being a Narrative of the Lord's Dealings with George Müller. Written by himself. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1861.

---

*The Romance by Dr. Holmes*, published by instalments in the "Atlantic," and now republished in two duodecimo volumes, differs from most serials in this, that it seems more like a whole. Serials tend in their organization to one radical disease. Their original sin is the want of unity. Every number must be a whole in itself, it must have its own special interest, its peculiar sparkle, or the reader is disappointed: he lays down the magazine, saying, "The number this month is not as good as usual." The unity of such a story is not therefore organic, but mechanical; not of growth, but of juxtaposition. It is not the

unity of a rose or a statue, but that of a nosegay or necklace. In all higher unity, there are parts, which, separated from the rest, are unintelligible and uninteresting. If one were to look at the statue of the Apollo in monthly *livraisons*, — the upper part of the head in January, the lower part in February, the right arm in March, — not only would he get no idea of the living unity of that immortal work, but probably these separate parts would not be strikingly interesting. The schoolboy who reads the "Iliad" fifty lines a day, or the Christian who reads the Book of Job a chapter at a time, sees neither the beauty of the parts nor the sublimity of the whole. Great works like the "Divine Comedy" of Dante, the "Fairy Queen" of Spenser, and the "Paradise Lost" of Milton, suffer much from the piecemeal way in which they are commonly read. But each flower in a bouquet, each pearl in a necklace, is a pretty thing by itself. For this reason, the unity of a serial must be that of the lower kind. If it has any unity at all when collected into a volume, it is fortunate. Too often it is tumbling to pieces, dislocated in all its joints, having a distorted nose, though with beautiful eyes and jet-black hair, like Horace's statue in "The School of Gladiators." The parts are elaborated; but the artist fails in producing a whole.

> "Infelix operis summâ, quia ponere totum
> Nesciet."

"Uncle Tom's Cabin," an exceptional work in all other respects, was also exceptional in this, — that, intensely interesting as was each weekly number in the "National Era," it became still more interesting when published as a whole. But this unity came from some special inspiration.

We therefore award no small praise to "Elsie Venner" in saying, that those who have read it with interest in the "Atlantic" will read it with still more interest in these volumes. The reason is partly the same as that of the unity in "Uncle Tom." Each has a purpose beyond that of amusement, and this purpose is the magnet which polarizes all the details. With all the wit of the book, it has a serious aim; viz., to show one of the limits of human responsibility. The leading character has an alien element in her blood, infused before birth, which affects her whole moral character, yet for which she can in no wise be held responsible. Such an extreme case shows us the principle which can be applied to others. It is the contribution of a medical student to ethics and theology. Based on undoubted facts in nature, it teaches us not to judge ourselves or others uncharitably. And, if to lose faith in one's self and others is dangerous, the lesson of this book may be very necessary.

We are pleased to see the new *Monthly*, edited by Dr. Randall and Dr. Huntington. It promises to be earnest and readable.

We trust it will have also the spirit of Christian courage and Christian freedom.

Of course, it is to be the *Church* Monthly. The idea of Church will naturally be very prominent in it. On the first two pages, we find the name of *Christ* mentioned *five* times, and the word *Church* mentioned *twenty-four times*. We suppose that this same proportion will hold through the number. This is natural; since, according to the theory of the Churchmen, while Christ is the only way to God, the Church is the only way to Christ. The chief danger is of losing sight of the end in the means. Let us hope that our brethren will avoid this error.

The second article in this number, called "The Living Church," is a good sign of what is to come. It is a very manly and able appeal in behalf of the substance of religion as against the mere form, the kernel of Christianity as being the essential thing. This article may be read with advantage by those of all sects. It sounds a little like a part of one of Brother Huntington's sermons; and, if it is, we assure him that it is liberal enough for us, and that, thus far, his Trinity does not appear to have injured him essentially.

The article on "Recent Inquiries in Theology" accuses Dr. Hedge and the "Christian Examiner" of "want of candor," of "disingenuousness," of being "unscrupulously ready to grasp at the aid of any prop," of introducing the book "under false colors," because the writers of the Essays are called "eminent divines" of the Church of England. "A divine," according to the common understanding of that term, means a clergyman. Several of these gentlemen are clergymen in orders in the Church of England: they are therefore, strictly and literally, "divines." That they are "eminent" this writer testifies of his own knowledge. He therefore brings a charge of want of truthfulness against the "Examiner" and against Dr. Hedge, of which charge his own article is a sufficient refutation. The writer of this article is said to be a gentleman whose own antecedents and present position do not make it in good taste for Dr. Huntington to put him forward as an accuser of the character of his former friends and associates.

We are pleased to see that the "Church Monthly" takes a different view of Mr. Mansel's book on "Limitations" than was taken by Dr. Huntington himself in his sermon on the Trinity. In a note to that sermon, he speaks of Mr. Mansel's "demonstrations of the general (?) principle, that the human consciousness is unequal to the speculative conception of a Being at once absolute, infinite, and personal;" but in his "Monthly" it is asserted that Mr. Mansel's position, that there can be no positive science of speculative theology, is "wholly erroneous and untenable."

Mr. Hall, of Dorchester, has preached, and by request of a number of his parishioners has printed, a sermon on "*Truth not to be Overthrown or Silenced.*" It is a generous and strong defence of the freedom of speech: timely, because uttered at the moment when an attempt had just been made to silence unpopular opinions; manly, because spoken before many persons who did not sympathize with it.

Müller's *Life of Trust* is the account of a man who relied on God, and so was able to do a great and wonderful work, — raising and distributing some $500,000 for missions, Bibles, and orphans, without any of the usual means and agencies. It is a book full of suggestion and of good sense, and ought to be in every parish library, Unitarian or Trinitarian.

---

## INTELLIGENCE.

THE Fiftieth Anniversary of the dedication of the Hollis-street Church, Boston, was celebrated on Thursday, Jan. 31. Rev. Charles F. Barnard commenced the services by reading appropriate selections from the Scriptures. A prayer was then offered by Rev. F. H. Hedge, D.D., of Brookline; and addresses made by Rev. E. S. Gannett, D.D., of the Federal-street Church; Rev. E. E. Hale, of the South Congregational Church; and Rev. John Weiss, who has for the present the supply of the pulpit. A letter was also read from Rev. T. S. King, the pastor of the church, now absent in San Francisco, Cal.

THE Church in Greenfield, Mass., which has been closed several months for enlargement and repairs, was opened for public worship a few Sundays since; on which occasion an appriate sermon was preached by the pastor, Rev. John F. Moors. Sixteen new pews have been added; making sixty-eight in all, capable of seating some three hundred and fifty persons. The alterations have been made at an expense of about three thousand dollars.

REV. JOHN K. KARCHER, formerly of Philadelphia, has taken charge of the Society in Toronto, Can., for one year.

REV. HENRY STONE, having finished his engagement of three months with the Society in Fond du Lac, Wis., has been invited to remain with them for a year; and has accepted the invitation.

Mr. Benjamin H. Bailey has accepted the call of the Society in Dedham, Mass.; and will be ordained Thursday, March 14. Rev. Dr. Francis, of Cambridge, will preach the sermon.

Rev. Edward Barker, formerly of Dover, Mass., has been invited to supply the pulpit of the Society in Charlestown, N.H., for three months.

Rev. Augustus Steinhart, until recently connected with the Baptist denomination, has been invited to take charge of the Unitarian Society in Toledo, O.; and has entered upon his duties.

Rev. William D. Haley preached his farewell sermon, as pastor of the Society in Washington, D.C., on Sunday, Feb. 3.

Mr. William H. Savary, a graduate of the Cambridge Divinity School in the class of 1860, has received a call from the Society in West Newton, Mass., to become their pastor.

Rev. William R. Alger, of Boston, has been chosen to preach the Annual Election Sermon before the Legislature, next year.

---

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

| 1861. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jan. 21. | From | Rev. A. A. Livermore's Society, Yonkers, N.Y., for Monthly Journals | $20.00 |
| „ 22. | „ | Rev. J. K. Hosmer's Society, Deerfield, for Monthly Journals | 21.00 |
| „ „ | „ | Rev. John Murray's Society, Northfield, for Monthly Journals | 11.00 |
| „ „ | „ | Lemuel Brackett, Esq., of Quincy, to make his pastor (Rev. J. D. Wells) and himself life-members | 60.00 |
| „ 23. | „ | Hawes-place Society, South Boston, for Monthly Journals | 37.00 |
| „ „ | „ | Rev. E. H. Hall's Society, Plymouth, for Monthly Journals | 22.00 |
| „ 24. | „ | Rev. S. J. May's Society, Syracuse, N.Y., for Monthly Journals | 20.00 |
| „ 25. | „ | Rev. W. G. Babcock's Society, Scituate, for Monthly Journals, additional | 2.00 |
| „ 26. | „ | Rev. E. B. Willson's Society, Salem, for Monthly Journals | 43.00 |
| „ „ | „ | Mr. B. F. Stamm, as a donation | 1.00 |
| „ 28. | „ | Society in Dedham, as a donation | 27.25 |

| 1861. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jan. | 29. | From | Rev. S. W. M'Daniel, on account, for books | $5.00 |
| " | " | " | Second Society, Brooklyn, N.Y., for Monthly Journals | 25.00 |
| " | " | " | Rev. Seth Chandler's Society, Shirley, for Monthly Journals | 11.00 |
| " | 30. | " | subscribers to Monthly Journal in West Church, Boston | 25.00 |
| " | 31. | " | Society in Marlborough, for Monthly Journals | 12.00 |
| " | " | " | sale of Tracts | 16.07 |
| " | " | " | scattered subscribers to Monthly Journal in January | 173.19 |
| Feb. | 1. | " | Rev. C. Lincoln's Society, Hingham, for Monthly Journals | 8.00 |
| " | 2. | " | Society in Warwick, for Monthly Journals | 8.00 |
| " | 4. | " | Rev. S. R. Calthrop's Society, Marblehead, for Monthly Journals | 17.00 |
| " | " | " | "Ladies' Mite Society," Marblehead, as a donation | 20.00 |
| " | " | " | Rev. Amos Smith's Society, Belmont, — for Monthly Journals $12.00 as a donation 9.78 | 21.78 |
| " | 5. | " | Society in Deerfield, for Monthly Journals, additional | 3.00 |
| " | " | " | First Society in Hingham, for Monthly Journals, additional | 1.00 |
| " | " | " | Rev. E. M. Wheelock's Society, Dover, N.H., for Monthly Journals | 16.00 |
| " | " | " | Miss L. E. Penhallow, for Kansas Mission | 1.00 |
| " | " | " | Rev. Horatio Wood, for Kansas Mission | 2.00 |
| " | 6. | " | Miss E. P. Sever, for books to be sent to Rev. C. H. A. Dall | 5.00 |
| " | " | " | Rev. Calvin S. Locke's Society, West Dedham, for Monthly Journals | 14.00 |
| " | 9. | " | Rev. G. M. Bartol's Society, Lancaster, for Monthly Journals | 17.00 |
| " | 11. | " | Rev. Ed. J. Young's Society, Newton Corner, for Monthly Journals | 55.00 |
| " | " | " | Rev. J. T. G. Nichols's Society, Saco, Me., for Monthly Journals | 36.00 |
| " | 12. | " | Rev. Charles H. Wheeler's Society, South Danvers, for Monthly Journals, additional | 2.00 |
| " | " | " | Dr. Miles Goodyear, Cortlandville, N.Y., as final payment on his life-membership | 5.00 |
| " | 13. | " | Augustus Story, Esq., of Salem, for India Mission | 25.00 |
| " | 14. | " | a friend, to make Dr. A. Sumner Haskell, of Hillsborough, Ill., a life-member | 30.00 |
| " | 15. | " | Mason-street Church, of Brunswick, Me., for Monthly Journals | 10.00 |
| " | 16. | " | subscribers to Monthly Journal in New Orleans, La. | 7.00 |
| " | " | " | Rev. Dr. Briggs's Society, Salem, for Monthly Journals, additional | 2.00 |
| " | " | " | Rev. J. C. Parsons's Society, Waltham, for Monthly Journals | 53.00 |
| " | 18. | " | Rev. Jonathan Cole's Society, Exeter, N.H., for Monthly Journals | 12.00 |
| " | " | " | Rev. E. G. Adams's Society, Templeton | 50.00 |